



PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE OF SOME FOREIGN COUNTRIES IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC CIVIL SERVICE FOR THE PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION CRIMES

Bahodirov Avazbek

Independent researcher at

Tashkent state university of Law

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10439031>

Annotation

This article examines the practical experience of foreign countries in preventing corruption crimes through the establishment of strong and effective public civil services. It discusses successful strategies implemented by countries such as Singapore, New Zealand, and Denmark, which emphasize transparency, accountability, and ethical behavior among public officials. The article provides valuable insights for other countries seeking to prevent corruption and promote good governance.

Key words: corruption crimes, public civil service, transparency, accountability, ethical behavior, Singapore, New Zealand, Denmark, anti-corruption agency, electronic procurement system, good governance.

In his speech, President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev at the ceremony of awarding the International Anti-Corruption Excellence Award spoke about the work carried out in the field of combating corruption, according to him Uzbekistan became a member of the International Open Data Charter in 2021. Our country is actively participating in the Istanbul Programme of Action, the Global Operational Network, the Eurasian and Egmont groups and many other platforms. It acts as the Secretariat of the West and Central Asian Asset Recovery Network. Tashkent annually hosts the traditional International Anti-Corruption Forum. In recent years our country has climbed 42 points in "Transparency International" index and has the highest ranking in our region. We aim to improve by another 50 points by 2030. In the Open Data Inventory ranking this year we have secured the 30th place. Uzbekistan ranks the 4th in the world on Open Data Sources [1].

It is symbolic that the award ceremony of the high international anti-corruption prize is taking place in Tashkent. Because in the following years, the wise policy pursued in Uzbekistan by our President Shavkat Mirziyoyev, the efforts aimed at the happy coexistence of our people, the successes achieved are recognized by the international community. It would not be an exaggeration to say that this is the trust of the world's states in Uzbekistan.

It is worth noting that in our country, the issue of combating corruption has been identified as the most important priority political direction. In this regard, a number of legislative acts have been adopted, and systematic work is underway. In particular, the law "On Combating Corruption" was adopted. This document made it possible to combine the anti-corruption forces and capabilities of government agencies and civil society institutions to create an integrated system.

As a result, our country has risen to 42 positions in the Transparency International index. By 2030, it is planned to improve its place in this ranking by another 50 positions. And

this year we have risen to the 30th place in the Open Data inventory ranking. According to open data sources, Uzbekistan ranks 4th in the world [2].

The prevention of corruption crimes is a key priority for many countries around the world. One approach to preventing corruption is to establish a strong and effective public civil service that is committed to transparency, accountability, and ethical behavior. Many countries have developed practical experience in this area and have implemented successful strategies to prevent corruption crimes.

One such country is Singapore, which has been consistently ranked as one of the least corrupt countries in the world. The Singaporean government has implemented a range of measures to prevent corruption, including strict laws and regulations, regular training and education for civil servants, and a culture of transparency and accountability. The government also uses technology to improve transparency, such as by implementing an electronic procurement system that reduces the potential for corruption in government procurement processes.

Another country with a strong track record in preventing corruption is New Zealand. The New Zealand government has established a code of conduct for public officials that emphasizes integrity, impartiality, and professionalism. The code is enforced through regular training and education programs, as well as through a formal complaints process. The government also uses technology to improve transparency and accountability, such as by publishing information about government spending and performance online.

In Denmark, the government has implemented a range of measures to prevent corruption, including strict laws and regulations, regular training and education for civil servants, and a culture of transparency and accountability. The government also uses technology to improve transparency, such as by implementing an electronic procurement system that reduces the potential for corruption in government procurement processes. In addition, the Danish government has established an independent anti-corruption agency to investigate and prosecute corruption crimes.

An important aspect of the Bulgarian experience is the need to provide information about personal interests. This information may include a statement of nonconformity, a declaration of personal interests, a statement that changes have occurred, and statements of personal interests in a particular situation.

A civil servant provides the above information within thirty days after election or appointment. In the declared declaration, an individual must indicate the circumstances leading to a conflict of interest, such as:

- 1) participation in commercial corporations, management or control bodies of non-profit legal entities or cooperatives, as well as carrying out entrepreneurial activities as an individual entrepreneur on the day of election or appointment and twelve months before the specified date;
- 2) agreements concluded by an official with any persons engaged in any activity in areas related to decisions taken within the framework of their official powers or duties;
- 3) information about any persons who are in close contact with a civil servant who have a personal interest in his activities; a public official is obliged to withdraw from the performance of his powers or official duties if there are personal interests in a particular situation. In addition, a public official may be removed from the exercise of his powers or



official duties in a particular case by a written act of the elector or appointing body, if the holder of this title has expressed personal interest [3].

The problem of conflict of interest in Latvia is regulated by the law "On the Prevention of Conflict of Interest in the activities of Public Officials".

The purpose of this law is to ensure that the actions of public officials meet the best interests of society, to prevent the influence of personal or financial interests of any official, his relatives or contractors on the actions of an official, to ensure openness in the actions of officials and their responsibility to society.

Persons who have the right to issue administrative documents in accordance with regulatory legal acts in the performance of their official duties in public authorities or self-government, as well as to exercise control, investigative or punitive functions against persons. officials are also persons who are not under their direct or indirect control, who deal with the property of the state or bodies local governments, including financial resources.

Officials may face a conflict of interest if they carry out at least one of the following activities in the performance of their duties:

- 1) perform the functions of control or punishment in relation to persons who do not directly or indirectly obey them;
- 2) make decisions on the submitted project;
- 3) making a decision affecting the use of the financial assistance provided [4].

The problem of conflict of interest in Slovenia is regulated by the Law on Integrity and Prevention of Corruption. In accordance with this law, a "conflict of interest" refers to circumstances in which the personal interest of an official in the performance of his public duties affects impartiality. In this sense, any officials are obliged to pay attention to any real or possible conflicts. They are prohibited from using their careers or jobs to pursue their own or anyone else's illegal personal interests. Unless another document provides for a different procedure, an official who has identified the possibility of a conflict of interest or the occurrence of such a conflict must immediately notify his supervisor or the Anti-Corruption Commission in writing during the occupation or performance of work or interest. If any delay is not dangerous, it will immediately stop work on the conflict of interest issue. If there is a possibility that there is a conflict of interest in the official actions of an official, the commission may initiate a procedure to determine the actual existence of this offender [5].

When analyzing the organizational and legal means of preventing conflicts of interest in the civil service of foreign countries, it can be seen that in many countries there is a systematic approach to this industry. In particular, in August 2004 Latvia approved the "State program for preventing and combating corruption" for 2004-2008. In accordance with the program, it was introduced that each State body prepares its departmental anti-corruption plans and sends them to the Bureau for the Prevention and Fight against Corruption. The Bureau was established as part of the Government structure on October 10, 2002 and operates with 145 civil servants. The Bureau for the Prevention and Fight against Corruption carries out its activities in accordance with the Code of Ethics, the law on combating Corruption, the law on the Bureau for the Prevention and Fight against Corruption, the law on the prevention of conflicts of interest in the activities of public officials. The specific functions of the Bureau for the prevention and combating of corruption have been defined. The Bureau has developed a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of departmental anti-corruption

plans and has implemented a quarterly assessment of the effectiveness of departmental plans based on the methodology [6].

Evaluating the effectiveness of anti-corruption activities in public administration in Korea, the model aims to: identify areas prone to corruption in the public sector and the true causes of corruption; study the dynamics of corruption in public organizations; encourage public authorities to participate in voluntary anti-corruption activities; provide preliminary information for the development of a National Anti-Corruption Strategy.

The evaluation model is based on the results of a survey of government employees, users of public services, internal customers and strategy experts. The Government's Anti-Corruption Commission collects and evaluates preliminary data for evaluation and publishes the results of the rating. The assessment also covers corruption-prone areas serving individuals and businesses. Non-governmental research organizations conduct anonymous surveys related to personal perceptions of corruption and methods of corruption (offering money, gifts, entertainment items or donations), during which respondents are asked to base on their real experiences. As a result of the assessment, a large amount of data was collected (in 2012, the assessment was carried out in 662 central government institutions, local authorities, educational institutions and organizations related to the provision of public services). The Anti-Corruption Commission states in its conclusions that the results of the assessment can be achieved at a faster pace by encouraging mutual competition for the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures in government organizations [7].

It has been studied from the experience of foreign countries that the assessment of corruption risks arising in the activities of public administration bodies and the assessment of the effectiveness of anti-corruption monitoring by the Competent authority is carried out on the basis of various methods. The active involvement of civil society institutions and non-governmental organizations in this process is ensured. The participation of these institutions also contributes to improving the adequacy of the application of assessment methods. Cases under public control involve conducting a preliminary assessment of relationships that may become the subject of evaluation in the future.

The Croatian Law on the Prevention of Conflicts of Interest of February 11, 2011 stipulates that an official, after being elected or appointed to a public position, must properly organize his personal affairs in order to prevent a conflict of interest that can be foreseen. If the latter does arise, the official is obliged to resolve it in such a way as to protect the public interest. In case of suspicion of a possible conflict of interests, an official is obliged to do everything necessary to separate personal interests from public ones.

When there is doubt about the existence of a conflict of interests of officials, he determines the rules for its elimination, indicating their actions. An official is obliged to submit a petition to the Conflict of interest commission within a 15-day period if he doubts that his behavior is consistent with the principles of the public office he holds.

At the same time, the law explicitly prohibits actions that lead to a conflict of interest, creating the necessary conditions to prevent the types of conflicts that arise as a result of conscious voluntary actions of officials. In particular, according to Croatian law, an official is prohibited from doing the following:

- receiving or requesting benefits in connection with the performance of public office;
- the possession of rights in violation of the principle of equality before the law;

abuse of the special rights of an official arising from the exercise by a public official;

receiving additional remuneration for performing tasks related to holding a public position;

to ask, accept, or receive something valuable or useful in exchange for a certain vote on an issue;

influence a decision made by an authority or a person in the interests of an individual or an interested person;

the promise of a job or other right in exchange for a gift or the promise of giving a gift;

impact on jobs or contracts through public procurement;

the use of confidential information about the activities of government agencies in the interests of an individual or in the interests of an interested person;

the use of official position in any other way that affects the decisions of legislative, executive or judicial authorities in order to obtain personal interest or the interest of an interested person, privilege or right [8].

Having studied the peculiarities of the emergence of the right to information, including the specifics of its legal consolidation, several prerequisites were identified for the emergence of the need for legal regulation of information, which are primarily of a public legal nature. In many ways, the public nature of such regulation is predetermined by the sphere of public relations – the socially significant purpose of the adoption of normative legal acts and historical features of the development of legal systems.

In Estonia, the Anti-Corruption Law of 2011 stipulates that an official cannot agree to hold a position or enter into an employment contract with him within one year after the termination of his powers [9].

Undoubtedly, an equally important element of the conflict of interest resolution mechanism is the creation, status and determination of the functioning of a special body that identifies and evaluates conflicts of interest (and sometimes facts of corruption). Including the Commission for the Prevention of Corruption (Slovenia), the Commission on Conflict of Interests (Republic of Croatia), the Commission on Conflict of Interests of the National Assembly (Bulgaria), the Interdepartmental Coordinating Council for Combating Corruption and the Public Service Bureau (Georgia), the Special Committee of the Riigikogu (Parliament of Estonia) on Combating Corruption, etc.

There are different procedures for the formation of these organs, and their composition is different. In Croatia, for example, the parliamentary Committee on Elections, Appointments and Administrative Affairs carefully selects candidates for members of the commission in advance. From among them, the Chairman and members of the commission are elected by Parliament by secret ballot by a majority vote of the total number of members of Parliament.

It should be noted that the existence of a single centralized public administration body in the field of preventing corruption and conflicts of interest is important. Unfortunately, in our country, we see that various government agencies are engaged in this area. In this regard, it is necessary to strengthen the status of the Agency of the Republic of Uzbekistan for Combating Corruption and become a state body pursuing a unified state policy in this area.



In general, the procedure for preventing conflicts of interest in the public administration system in foreign countries has the following common features:

notification of an existing or probable conflict of interest of a higher official;

if a conflict of interest is related to the adoption of a certain decision or the implementation of certain actions, it is necessary to immediately bring this fact to the attention of the head, which requires the temporary suspension of the relevant official from exercising his powers until the appropriate decision is made;

refuse gifts or consider them separately;

in the event that it is impossible to avoid unauthorized gifts, you must immediately notify an authorized official of your authorities.

In conclusion, the practical experience of foreign countries in the field of public civil service for the prevention of corruption crimes can provide valuable insights for other countries seeking to prevent corruption. Countries like Singapore, New Zealand, and Denmark have implemented successful strategies that emphasize transparency, accountability, and ethical behavior among public officials. These strategies can be adapted and implemented in other countries to help prevent corruption and promote good governance.

References:

1. Address by the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev at the ceremony of awarding the International Anti-Corruption Excellence Award. <https://president.uz/en/lists/view/6934>.
2. <https://parliament.gov.uz/articles/1933>.
3. https://anticor.hse.ru/main/news_page/v_bolgarii_prinyat_novyy_antikorrupsionnyy_zakon.
4. <https://anticor.hse.ru/main/country/Latvia>.
5. Латвияс Вестнесис» («Latvijas Vēstnesis»), 69 (2644), 09.05.2002, «Вестник», 11, 13.06.2002 https://www.knab.gov.lv/upload/rus/iknl_ru_2013.10.pdf.
6. <https://anticor.hse.ru/main/country/Slovenia>.
7. <https://www.theworldlawgroup.com/news/south-korea-anti-corruption-guide-2022>.
8. <https://anticor.hse.ru/main/country/Croatia>.
9. Anticorruption Act Passed 06.06.2012. RT I. 29.06.2012. 1. URL: http://europam.eu/data/mechanisms/COI/COI%20Laws/Estonia/Anticorruption%20Act_2012_amended%202016.pdf